The heart of being can have no exclusions akin to those which our poor little hearts set up.
—WILLIAM JAMES

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 52 APRIL, 1964 NUMBER 6

THEOSOPHY YESTERDAY AND TODAY

WHILE neither philosophic truth nor essential human need changes very much, from age to age, the historical environment in which truth is sought and needs are felt often changes a great deal. The extreme difference in epochs may be illustrated by contrasting the latter half of the nineteenth century with the corresponding decades of the present.

A hundred years ago, Western culture was entering a stage of dramatic scientific progress and at the same time a period of high faith in the promise of the scientific method. Darwin's *Origin of Species,* for example, had been published in 1859, and the progressive spirits of the era were busy assimilating and defending its implications. While there were wars during the second half of the nineteenth century—the Crimean War, the American Civil War, and the Franco-Prussian War—the long peace which followed was accompanied by extraordinary industrial progress, and a comparative prosperity fed the optimism of the times. England was filled with the pride and complacency of the Victorian Age. The United States was settling and exploiting the West. The powerful nation-states that would come into evidence during the twentieth century were in the process of formation. A kind of high noon in the development of Western civilization provided the temper of the educated classes, while the less attractive effects of the Industrial Revolution were silently shaping the volcanic forces of class struggle and social revolt that would later burst into far-reaching action.

How different the prevailing spirit of the present! Instead of confidence and enthusiastic expectations in relation to the achievements of science, we are filled with apprehensions at the ease with which modern technology, schooled in nuclear physics, may lay waste the entire world. While philosophers in the closing years of the nineteenth century were calm rationalizers of the "progress" they saw on every hand, today they search for the meaning of the human essence beneath the psychological rubble left by two shattering world wars. While systems of cosmology were deduced from the fruits of physical inquiry of eighty and ninety years ago, the meaning of human life in confinement, under pressure, and oppressed by extreme situations engrosses the serious thinkers of the present. The physical world, once held to be so important, and from which, through the investigations of physics, chemistry and biology, we were to learn the fundamental secrets of nature, has become a mere technical shell which surrounds the areas of truly significant experience—man's feelings and thoughts about himself.

The best men of the age are now noticeably indifferent to the kind of "progress" which once claimed the attention of those who attempt to take responsibility for and to speak for their time. Not the physical relations of the world, but the psychological relations of man—these are the important considerations. Old claims and assertions about physical reality no longer bear authority. Disproofs of "materialism" have little significance to the students of today, who have turned their attention to matters of immediate concern to their *feelings*. It is as though a vast arena of controversy had suddenly disappeared from view, being replaced by more personal laboratories of investigation and demonstration.

Not the romance and adventure of innovation, but its bleak and even frightening necessity, is the keynote of the age. From the viewpoint of the awakened individual of the present, young or old, the academic notions of past generations seem so much involved in totally dead issues that an entirely new curriculum may soon become necessary in the schools, if students are to gain a sense of reality from their education.

Already the "fringe" movements are claiming a large proportion of the young. While the frothy episodes of recent psyche-social history may seem to rise and subside like short-lived fads, they leave their effect, and they ought to be recognized as symptoms of hidden

causes deep in the psyche of the twentieth century. The "beatniks" may have left the headlines and the illustrated pages of the slick magazines, but the sense of emptiness and disillusionment behind the alienation of the beats is still there, generating miscellaneous vacuums which affect the coming generations in miscellaneous ways. The "flash news" techniques of the newspaper and magazine media through which we keep up with the times are not helpful in leading to an understanding of prevailing human attitudes. These press treatments skim off the sensational aspect of social events, and when the novelty wears out turn to more exciting matters. The result is that the reader's impression of his world comes in the form of a series of nervous irritations, without continuity or meaning. Yet the oddities and bizarre goings-on so reported are representative of actualities which, turning rapidly in the centrifuge of socio-moral transition, cast up fragments and chaotic phenomenal appearances which attract passing attention. Eventually, the causes themselves will come to the surface, and to many it will seem that they arrived suddenly, without warning or premonitory symptoms.

These are some of the means by which an age gets down to asking the fundamental questions—questions which, in our own age, as in every other, are asked in the terms of the hungers and deprivations of the human heart.

Eventually, we may hope and expect, these questions will take a form which relates them to the vocabulary of the Theosophical philosophy. At first, no doubt, the relationship will seem oblique or indirect. For example, in the investigations of humanistic psychology, there are many hints which point to the importance of metaphysical inquiry, but no forthright steps in this direction. And, in relation to the subjective life of persons who are moved to find out something about the self through introspection, there are already vague differentiations of the categories of subjective experience, but nothing to resemble the careful topography of the inner life that is presented in the *Voice of the Silence*. This devotional aspect of metaphysics proves its value only to those who have become aware of the wilderness of the lower psychic principles in man's nature, and who have reason to be grateful to teachers who know the entirety of this territory from first-hand experience.

Nonetheless, the questions are beginning, and in some instances answers already returned amount to intuitive approximations of

certain of the Theosophical teachings—as found, say, in Carl Jung's posthumously published *Memories, Dreams, Reflections,* or in Herbert Fingarette's *The Self in Transformation.* The important thing to be noted is that these conclusions are coming, not from the "arguments" presented in terms of abstract philosophical ideas, nor from polemics against "materialism," but from the searching inquiry of men attentive to the psychological and ethical needs of other human beings, and to the instruction of their own minds and hearts. These responses to need, these explications of subjective awareness, are the *good* symptoms of the changing times, the first brave declarations, it may be, of a flooding tide of conviction that will find articulation in the future.

In all epochs, Theosophical activity finds expression by means of two channels—one representing a learning of what has been taught by earlier teachers, the other embodying fruits of a currently deepening self-awareness, provoked and guided by the "teaching," and given immediate, contemporary life through the experience of individuals. In the present, we seem to be getting forerunning evidence of this vital aspect of Theosophical development, in an uprising tide of readiness on the part of men who have in them an intuitive sense of the cycle's great need.

THE RESILIENCE BEHIND INSTITUTIONS

Human institutions and civilizations die, but mankind survives and continues moving forward and upward. It continues moving because human beings are more resilient than the institutions of which they are a part, and especially because some remain creative, even though their civilization has exhausted its collective potentialities. More important, perhaps, there have always been men willing to struggle, to suffer and even to die for causes unrelated to their own interest or comfort.

—RENÉ DUBOS

letters • questions • comment

If the ethical implication of the teaching of Karma is that of individual responsibility for surrounding circumstances, how great an obligation does this suggest in respect to the Theosophist's involvement with community, state, and national political affairs? To say "the ego is timeless" may become a way of begging the question, and neglecting the person's need to become an active agent in relation to whatever point of space-time he occupies. Have not Theosophists often isolated themselves from the obligations which attend upon the social contracts that govern human affairs through legislation? In other words, a feeling of alienation from efforts to improve human affairs by unprincipled methods may need to be resolved by discovering for one's self an active, if different, role to play in political campaigns, polls preceding debates on current legislation, etc.

One way of describing the Theosophical objective would be to say that the Theosophist feels a pressing need to bring a genuine "language of the soul" into currency. Such a language has to be a natural emergence, but it can be stimulated by a diversified expression of the Theosophical tenets. And to the degree that such a genuine language of the soul exists, men's attitudes can respond, and matters usually considered to be "political" or "economic" or "social" can then be discussed in ways that suggest radically different attitudes and alternatives to action.

In the Gospel according to St. John we have a clue to the symbolic meaning behind much of the story of Genesis, because this Gospel begins by saying; "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." So we might say that for a man to emerge, a language for the next step in his evolutionary pilgrimage must first come into being—gradually, from many sources—a synthesizing language, a language which touches religion, which has implications in politics, and which implicitly contains within it the philosophy of education.

These considerations, we think, are not a begging of the question,

for they relate to the opportunity of the individual to discover his own dynamic of "political action." A paragraph from Dwight Macdonald's *The Root is Man* might be taken to illustrate the influence small groups of Theosophists might have on the body politic:

> We must begin way at the bottom again, with small groups of individuals in various countries, grouped around certain principles and feelings they have in common. These should probably not be physically isolated communities as was the case in the 19th century since this shuts one off from the common experience of one's fellowmen. They should probably consist of individuals—families, rather—who live and make their living in the everyday world but who come together often enough and intimately enough to form a *psychological* (as against a geographical) community. The purpose of such groups would be twofold. Within itself, the group would exist so that its members could come to know each other as fully as possible as human beings (the difficulty of such knowledge of others in modern society is a chief source of evil), to exchange ideas and discuss as fully as possible what is "on their minds" (not only the atomic bomb but also the perils of child-rearing), and in general to learn the difficult art of living with other people. The group's purpose toward the outside world would be to take certain actions together (as, against Jim Crow in this country, or to further pacifism), to support individuals whether members of the group or not who stand up for the common ideals, and to preach those ideals—or, if you prefer, make propaganda—by word and by deed, in the varied everyday contacts of the group members with their fellow-men.

Another passage which develops the same theme occurs in an article by Andrea Caffi, published in an Appendix to *The Root is Man*:

> As long as today's problems are stated in terms of "mass politics" and "mass organization," it is clear that only States and mass parties can deal with them. But, if the solutions that can be offered by the existing States and parties are acknowledged to be either futile or wicked, or both, then we must look not only for different "solutions" but especially for a different way of stating the problems themselves.
>
> We must conclude that the first thing to do, in order to get to the point where "politics of the people" will be more than a phrase, is to begin from the beginning, that is: with the rescue of individuals from the mass that mechanizes and dehumanizes them. We must find again the direct language, the genuine feelings, the clear notions, the limpid images through which we can establish a true communication with the "people."

ON FIRST ACQUAINTANCE— "THE SECRET DOCTRINE"

X

THE Kumaras," explains an esoteric text, "are the Dhyanis, derived immediately from the supreme Principle, who reappear in the Vaivasvata Manu period, for the progress of mankind." They may indeed mark a "special" or extra *creation,* since it is they who, by incarnating themselves within the senseless human shells of the two first Root-races and a great portion of the Third Root-race, create, so to speak, a "new" race: that of thinking, self-conscious, and divine men. The Kumaras, the "mind-born Sons" of *Brahma-Rudra* (or Siva), the howling and terrific *destroyer of human passions and physical senses,* which are ever in the way of the development of the higher spiritual perceptions and the growth of the *inner* eternal man—mystically, are the progeny of Siva, the *Mahayogi,* the great patron of all the Yogis and mystics of India. They themselves, being the "Virgin-Ascetics," refuse to create the *material* being MAN.

Siva-Rudra is the Destroyer, as Vishnu is the preserver; and both are the regenerators of spiritual as well as of physical nature. To live as a plant, the *seed* must die: to live as a conscious entity in the Eternity, the passions and senses of man must "die" before his body does. "To live is to die and to die is to live," has been too little understood in the West. Siva the destroyer is the *creator* and the Saviour of Spiritual man, as he is the good gardener of nature. He weeds out the plants, human and cosmic, and kills the passions of the physical, to call to life the perceptions of the spiritual, man.

It is interesting that the Kumaras "who acquired entire exemption from passion" remain *creators* of the eternal man. It may be that they create by proximity of condition rather than generation.

It may also be that, by fixing our attention upon the metaphysical aspect of man, we can recreate the physical, making it relatively "dead" or inattentive to pursuits of sensation and passion. By focusing on the Higher-Ego, our physical lives may be remade as they become absorbed in the new undertaking. Is not this remaking

by "proximity rather than generation" just as "fragrance affects the mind from its proximity . . . *and not from any immediate operation upon mind itself.*"

Just as it is true that passion will collect and intensify the attention, for purposes of physical generation, so it might also be true that a development of the Will enables one to collect and intensify the attention for another kind of creation. It is possible that these two types of creation use the same Principle: one, to create a body; the other, to create by means of a change of condition—by metaphysical embodiment.

While it may be said that, at best, our lives as physical beings on earth are the dark aspects of our Higher Ego, still we can become true sons of the "Father"—just as the moon, however feebly, is still a true reflection on a cloudless night. Michael in his best aspect would seem to be a manifested representation of the unseen prototype: "Jehovah Sabbaoth, *The angel of whose face is* Mikael."

Man, by choice, or by the collective leaning of his thousands of choices, can become patterned after his heavenly Prototype; or he can seek a closer union with matter and form. Yet the seekers after a material life are eloquent witnesses to its distaste, to its lack of completeness, to its illusionary flowing quality which seems to fit it only as an instrumentality to other pursuits than an embodiment of goals.

What is passion, other than a seeking of union with another being? Hopefully, it is true and total union that every being seeks; yet where is oneness to be found, where is it to be seen as a growing realization within the frame of one's mind-journey? The *Secret Doctrine* tells us that:

> METAPHYSICALLY and esoterically there is but One ELEMENT in nature, and at the root of it is the Deity; and the so-called *seven* elements, of which five have already manifested and asserted their existence, are the garment, *the veil, of that deity;* direct from the essence whereof comes MAN, whether physically, psychically, mentally or spiritually considered. (I, 460.)

Our physical lives are a sort of veil for our mind-life. Devotion to the Higher Mind might be a natural process of emasculation as far as physical creation is concerned; for the creative power will be absorbed in another type of creation. The collection and intensity

of the mind, as concerned with the condition of Life in general rather than life in particular, would naturally affect the pursuits and proclivities of the physical man.

That there may be a single power acting on both the plane of generation and that of mental causation seems alluded to in Thomas Taylor's discussion of Ulysses' adventures (*Porphyry's Select Works* —Appendix). Here Taylor says of the allegory regarding Circe:

> We shall find in it some deep arcana of philosophy contained, exclusive of its connexion with Ulysses. By the Æean isle, then, in which the palace of Circe was situated, the region of sorrow and lamentation is signified, as is evident from the name of the island itself. And, by Circe, we must understand the Goddess of sense. Homer calls the period and revolution of regeneration in a circle, Circe, the daughter of the Sun, who perpetually connects and combines all corruption with generation, and generation again with corruption. And this is asserted still more explicitly by Proclus, who says, "Circe is that divine power which weaves all the life contained in the four elements, and, at the same time, by her song harmonizes the whole sublunary world. But the shuttle with which she weaves, is represented by theologists as golden, because her essence is intellectual, pure, immaterial, and unmingled with generation; all which is signified by the shuttle being golden. . . ."
>
> Hence we may observe, that the Æean isle, or this region of sense, is, with great propriety, called the abode of trouble and lamentation. In this region, then, the companions of Ulysses, in consequence of being very imperfect characters, are changed, through the incantations of the Goddess, into brutes, i.e., into unworthy and irrational habits and patterns. Ulysses, however, as one who is returning, though slowly, to the proper perfection of his nature, is, by the assistance of Mercury, or reason, prevented from destruction. Hence intellect, roused by its impassive power which is able to repel the allurements of pleasure, wars on sensible delight, and prevents the effects of its transforming power.
>
> After this follows the allegory respecting the descent of Ulysses into *Hades,* which occultly signifies, that he still lived a life according to sense, and not according to intellect, and that, in consequence of not having yet vanquished a terrestrial life, he was involved in *obscurity*.
>
> Ulysses descending into Hades, saw, among others, Sysiphus, and Tityus, and Tantalus. And Tityus he saw lying on the earth, and a vulture devouring his liver; the liver signifying that he

lived solely according to that part of the soul which is the source of desire.

But Sysiphus, living under the domination of ambition and anger, was employed in continually rolling a stone up an eminence, because it perpetually descended again; its descent implying the vicious government of himself; and his rolling the stone, the hard, refractory, and, as it were, rebounding condition of his life. And, lastly, he saw Tantalus extended by the side of a lake, and that there was a tree before him, with abundance of fruit on its branches, which he desired to gather, but it vanished from his view. And this indeed indicates, that he lived under the dominion of the phantasy; but his hanging over the lake, and in vain attempting to drink, denotes the elusive, humid, and rapidly-gliding condition of such a life.

After experiencing many dangers and heroic achievements, Ulysses is enabled to hasten his return to a life governed by the intellect for he is helped "through Mercury, or reason, who prevails upon the Goddess of Phantasy to yield his dismission." Taylor continues:

Hence, after her consent, Ulysses is, with great propriety, said to have placed himself on the throne on which Mercury had sate: for reason then resumes her proper seat when the reasoning power is about to abandon the delusive and detaining charms of imagination.

But as he is now earnestly engaged in departing from sense, he must unavoidably be pursued by the anger of Neptune, the lord of generation and a sensible life, whose service he has forsaken. Hence, in the midst of these delightful contemplations, he is almost overwhelmed by the waves of misfortune, roused by the wrath of his implacable foe. He is, however, through divine assistance, or Leucothea, enabled to sustain the dreadful storm. For, receiving from divinity the immortal fillet of true fortitude, and binding it under his breast, (the proper seat of courage), he encounters the billows of adversity, and bravely shoots along the boisterous ocean of life.

That the island of Phæacia is the dominion of reason, is, I think, indisputably confirmed by Homer's account of the ships fabricated by its inhabitants. For of these, he says:

So shalt thou instant reach the realm assign'd
In wond'rous ships self-mov'd, instinct with mind.
No helm secures their course, no pilot guides,
Like man intelligent they plough the tides,
Conscious of ev'ry coast and ev'ry bay,
That lies beneath the sun's all-seeing ray;
And veil'd in clouds impervious to the eye,
Fearless and rapid through the deep they fly.

> These did the ruler of the deep ordain
> To build proud navies, and command the main;
> On canvas wings to cut the wat'ry way,
> No bird more light, *no thought more swift than they.*

So we see, by these extracts from Taylor, that Homer unfolds to us "an allegory pregnant with latent meaning."

There is a sense in which we can say this of all H.P.B.'s writings as well, even though hers was not the allegorical idiom. Her writings would seem to contain layers of meaning which unfold only in a certain order, *i.e.*, one does not perceive their deepest meaning immediately, but tends to grow into their deeper layers of meaning as he embodies them in his life. It is interesting, here, to recall the notes of Mr. Bowen on oral teachings given by H.P.B. shortly before her death, when she spoke of what *The Secret Doctrine* was meant to achieve. Mr. Bowen writes:

> *The Secret Doctrine* is only quite a small fragment of the Esoteric Doctrine known to the higher members of the Occult Brotherhoods. It contains, she says, just as much as can be received by the world during this coming century. "The world" (she explained), means Man living in the Personal Nature. This "world" will find in the two volumes of the *S.D.* all its utmost comprehension can grasp, but no more. But this is not to say that the Disciple who is not living in "the world" cannot find any more in the book than the "world" finds. Every form, no matter how crude, contains the image of the "creator" concealed within it. So likewise does an author's work, no matter how obscure, contain the concealed image of the author's knowledge. . . .
>
> Come to the *S.D.* (she says) without any hope of getting the final Truth of existence from it, or with any idea other than seeing how far it may lead *towards* the Truth. See in study a means of exercising and developing the mind never touched by other studies. . . .
>
> I suggested that this is a kind of mental exercise which must be excessively fatiguing. H.P.B. smiled and nodded. One must not be a fool (she said) and drive oneself into the madhouse by attempting too much at first. The brain is the instrument of waking consciousness, and every conscious mental picture formed means change and destruction of the atoms of the brain. Ordinary intellectual activity moves on well-beaten paths in the brain, and does not compel sudden adjustments and destructions in its substance. But this new kind of mental effort calls for something very different—the carving out of new "brain paths," the ranking in different order of the little brain lives. If forced injudiciously it may do serious physical harm to the brain.

YOUTH FORUM

Every human being, we are often told, and every other point of consciousness in the universe, has its own unique place and function in relation to the whole. Yet many people are privately in despair because they do not know what their real place should be. Just what can each of us do to find out and fulfill the special secret intention of his life?

Although many people in this vast and rootless world do not feel a deep vocation or calling in life, and so no doubt sense the poignancy of this question, they might still object to it on the basis of the way it is phrased; for as it stands, it makes several large presuppositions, one of which is that the universe *is* a whole, and another, that there is a unique intention for every life. Without at least a tentative acceptance of these postulates, the question is groundless, and therefore ought to be meaningless. Yet if you try to dismiss the question, to speak of the impossibility of finding proof for such presuppositions, the poignancy still remains. And in a sense, perhaps this deep and continuing malaise constitutes in itself a kind of proof. As Emerson puts it: "We grant that human life is mean, but how did we find out that it was mean? What is the ground of this uneasiness of ours, of this old discontent? What is the universal sense of want and ignorance but the *fine innuendo by which the soul makes its enormous claim?*"

Most people, at one time or another, have felt within themselves this claim for transcendency, but the problem for each one is to determine, within the context of everyday life, just what that claim entails. Certainly, since every ego is an individual, and is working through the web of his own karmic environment, the nature of that duty or claim will vary with each person. And if the claim is in some way being made within every spark of consciousness in evolution, there is likely to be a generic aspect as well as the particular. That is to say, at heart this duty must be quite simple, even if its individual expressions are infinite, for it is as much the duty of a tree or of a

bird as of man. Perhaps most basically it is the duty to grow and to become, which means to give expression to powers latent within. If so, then as human beings we must first of all try to discover what our powers are, and how they ought to be expressed.

We must not imagine, either, that these powers are negligible; for man's connection with the rest of the universe (hinted at just now), is in reality such a deep connection that all the powers of life are latent within him, in the same way as that a seed—the highest fulfillment of a plant's "duty"—contains within itself all the potentialities of that plant. Or, to paraphrase Eliot's words about poetry and apply them to man himself: he is the focus and incantation of the Word. And so the process of expressing our own powers is far from easy; and, in fact, will continue for an eternity. Yet, if the powers are there and we do keep searching for them, we are bound to rediscover them, one by one, with the passing of time. As to the ways they should most naturally be expressed, we can feel sure at least that they should not be used for the detriment of other beings; for it is our *duty* to express them, and "duty" means "what we owe to life."

It is good to see the universal counterpart of our individual duties, to see all of life as being infused with a generalized impulse of aspiration, but of course the problem of the individual and of his particular mode of aspiration remains. One natural thing to do, in order to discover our own unique calling, is to learn to listen well; for if we do not listen, we cannot hear the call. And it is surprising how greatly our listening power may be sharpened if we maintain within ourselves a strict honesty—for sometimes we do not hear a call because we do not really *want* to hear it, sensing, perhaps, that a great deal would be demanded of us if we did hear, and tried to answer. We may be sure that a great deal would indeed be demanded; all, in fact, that we can supply.

But aside from the everyday duties—specific situations which require so much of our time and attention—there is to be considered the over-all vocation of a lifetime. For some this vocation is made quite evident by certain inclinations or talents, but for a great many it is far from evident, and causes constant anxiety, making us ask ourselves: Is this what I was meant to spend my life doing? Is this all? In these instances, we might say that the very existence of such anxiety indicates that secretly we do demand more of ourselves than

we are presently giving.

But more in what way? Is it some more noble endeavor—material or artistic—which we ask of ourselves, or might it be a more creative and human approach to what we are already doing? "Both thou and I," says Krishna, "have passed through many births. Mine are known unto me, but thou knowest not of thine." If we could for a moment see all our past existences, we would no doubt learn that we have taken up at one time or another almost every conceivable vocation. This does not mean that what we do now is unimportant, for every lifetime has its own basic intention and significance. It does, though, give us a broader perspective on this matter of vocation, and indicates that no matter what we do, the most important consideration is how much we learn from our experiences, how much we grow, to what degree we have unfolded a little more of the spiritual powers within us.

And therefore, even if in spite of our attempts to listen well, and to feel our way along towards some particular vocation, we do not succeed in finding one that strikes a deep response within us, perhaps we do not really need to despair, or spend our lifetime restlessly waiting to be "called." Instead of wasting our time that way, hoping eventually to be kissed by some muse, we ourselves can let out a shout; and then follow the echo of our own voice. After all, we have worked our way through every vocation already; and if we make a conscious choice, in strict honesty, and in the hope that we can serve life best through the sort of work we are considering doing, it is difficult to imagine that we could go far wrong.

No thinking person's choices are easy these days. There has been a severing of spiritual roots, of man's natural umbilical relationship with the living center of life—and in this country, even of historical roots. But perhaps the re-issuing of roots need not be such a terribly painful ordeal as we might imagine. It is, in some ways of course: contact with the world's sneering selfishness cannot help being another wound to our already torn inner structure. Yet there are easy ways as well. Just liking people is an easy way of healing roots, just looking at them, or looking out the window at some new apartment house and realizing how transient it is, and yet that human beings are living there, creating homes there, endowing the cold impersonal walls with their feelings, their wistful, sometimes beautiful, perhaps eternal, feelings.

THE CHALDEAN LEGEND

Of the *dead* sciences of the past, there is a fair minority of earnest students who are entitled to learn the few truths that may now be given to them. —H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE Chaldean religion is entirely lost to the world now, except in its disfigured Sabeanism as rendered by archeologists. It is the outcome of three great religions, the Indian, the Mazdean, and the Egyptian, and bears direct relationship to all of these. The Chaldean *Book of Numbers* was derived from the "Book of Dzyan" described in theosophical literature. And of the Chaldean works which are translated into Arabic and preserved by some Sufi initiates, it is asserted that the public knows nothing. The Sabeans were astrolaters, so called; those who worshipped the stars—or rather their "regents." Sabeanism was thus the religion of the ancient Chaldees. They believed in one impersonal, universal deific Principle, although they never mentioned It, but offered worship to the solar, lunar, and planetary gods and rulers, regarding the stars and other celestial bodies as their respective symbols. The Chaldeans, or *Kasdim,* were at first a tribe, and then a caste of learned Kabbalists. They were the savants, the magians of Babylonia, astrologers and diviners. The famous Hillel, the precursor of Jesus in philosophy and ethics, was a Chaldean.

In every cosmogony, behind and higher than the *creative* Deity there is a superior Deity, a planner, an architect, of whom the Creator is but the executive agent. And still higher, *over* and *around, within* and *without,* there is the UNKNOWABLE and the *unknown,* the Source and Cause of all these Emanations. In Chaldea the great First Cause as the ONE, the primordial germ, the unrevealed and grand ALL, existing through himself—was *Ilu*. This was the Kabbalistic En-Soph (No-thing). Whenever the Eternal awakes from its slumber and desires to manifest itself, it divides itself into male and female. It then becomes in every system the double-sexed Deity, the universal Father and Mother, the *Anu-Anata* (male-female) of

---

NOTE.—A student's collation from standard Theosophical works.

the Chaldeans. From the union of the two a third, or creative Principle—the SON, or the manifested Logos—is the product of the Divine Mind. In Chaldea the Son was *Bel.* Moreover, every such system has a triple male trinity, each proceeding separately through itself from one female Deity. In Chaldea the trinity of Anu, Bel, and Hea, blend into One who is Anu (double-sexed) through the Virgin Mylitta.

To place it still clearer, the Babylonian system recognized first the ONE (Ad), who is never named but only acknowledged in thought, as the Hindu Swayambhuva. From this he becomes manifest as Anu, the one above all—Monas. Next comes the Demiurge (the "Builder" or executive Architect of the Universe) called Bel, who is the active power of the Godhead. The third is the principle of wisdom, Hea, who also rules the sea and the underworld. Each of these—*Anu, Bel,* and *Hea*—has his divine consort, giving us *Anata, Belta,* and *Davkina.* These, however, are only like the Shaktis, the "forces" of Nature. But the female principle is denoted by Mylitta, the Great Mother, called also Ishtar. With the three male gods we have the Triad, or *Trimurti.* "The fact is, that all the three 'persons' of the Trimurti are simply three qualitative attributes of the universe of differentiated Spirit-Matter; the self-formative, the self-preserving, and the self-destroying, for purposes of regeneration and perfectibility." With Mylitta added to the Trimurti we have the *Arba* or Four (*Tetraktys* of Pythagoras), which perfects and potentializes *all.*

Bel was the oldest and mightiest of the gods of Babylonia, one of the earliest trinities. He was "Lord of the World," father of the gods and "Lord of the city of Nippur." *Hea* was the maker of fate, Lord of the Deep, God of Wisdom and esoteric Knowledge, and Lord of the city (i.e., Mysteries) of Eridu. *Anu* was the earliest god of the city of Erech. The "doctrine of the Trinity" is first met northeast of the Indus; and, tracing it to Asia Minor and Europe, one recognizes it among every people who had anything like an established religion. It was taught in the oldest Chaldean, Egyptian, and Mithraic schools. The Chaldean Sun-god, Mithra, was called "Triple" and the trinitarian idea of the Chaldeans was a doctrine of the Akkadians who, themselves, belonged to a race which was the first to conceive a metaphysical trinity. According to the archeologist Rawlinson, the Chaldeans were a tribe of the Akkadians who

lived in Babylonia from earliest times; but according to others they were Turanians who instructed the Babylonians into the first notions of religion. But these same Akkadians, who were they? The only tradition worthy of credence is that these Akkadians instructed the Babylonians in the Mysteries, and taught them the sacerdotal or Mystery language. These Akkadians were then simply a tribe of the Hindu-Brahmans—now called Aryans—and their vernacular language, the Sanskrit of the Vedas; and the sacred or Mystery language, that which, even in our own age, is used by the Hindu fakirs and initiated Brahmans in their magical evocations. They were emigrants on their way to Asia Minor from India, the cradle of humanity, and their sacerdotal adepts tarried to civilize and initiate a barbarian people.

The Babylonian civilization was neither born nor developed in that country. It was imported from India, and the importers were Brahmanical Hindus. Whether the latter were Brahmans from the Brahmanic planisphere proper (40° north latitude) or from India (Hindustan), or again from the India of Central Asia, we will leave to philologists of the future to decide. Science has discovered enough to inform us that Sanskrit originals of Nepal, were translated by Buddhist missionaries into nearly every Asiatic tongue. Likewise Pali manuscripts were translated in Siamese, and carried to Burma and Siam; it is easy therefore to account for the same religious myths circulating in so many countries. But Manetho tells us also of Pali shepherds who emigrated westward; and when we find some of the oldest Ceylonic traditions in the Chaldean Kabbala and Jewish Bible, we must think that either Chaldeans or Babylonians had been in Ceylon or India, or the ancient Pali had the same traditions as the Akkadians, whose origin is so uncertain. Suppose even Rawlinson to be right, that the Akkadians did come from Armenia, he did not trace them farther back. As the field is open to any kind of hypothesis, we submit that this tribe might as well have come to Armenia from beyond the Indus, following their way in the direction of the Caspian Sea—a part of which was also India once upon a time—and from thence to the Euxine. Or they might have come originally from Ceylon by the same way.

Genesis is purely a reminiscence of the Babylonian captivity. The names of places, men, and even objects can be traced from the original text to the Chaldeans and the Akkadians, the progenitors

and Aryan instructors of the former. The garden of Eden as a locality is no myth at all; it belongs to those landmarks of history which occasionally disclose to the student that the Bible is not *all* mere allegory. In the Chaldean Book of Numbers the location of Eden is designated by numerals, and in the cipher Rosicrucian manuscript left by Count St. Germain it is fully disclosed. The Elohim may be accepted in one sense for gods or powers, and taken in another one for the *Aleim,* or priests; the Hierophants initiated into the good and evil of the world. For there was a college of priests called the Aleim, while the head of their caste, or the chief of the hierophants, was known as Java Aleim. In the Chaldean as well as in every exoteric scripture, Beings who *refuse to create,* i.e., who are said to oppose thereby the Demiurge, are denounced as the spirits of Darkness. The "Fallen Angels" and the legend of the "War in Heaven" is purely pagan in its origin and comes from India via Persia and Chaldea.

The fable of the Deluge—both the Hindu and the Chaldean account—has been considered by orthodox commentators to have been borrowed from the Mosaic scriptures. But surely if such a *universal* cataclysm had ever taken place within man's memory, some of the monuments of the Egyptians, of which many are of such tremendous antiquity, would have recorded the occurrence. But till now there has not been found the remotest allusion to such calamity. On the other hand the Chaldeans preserved the tradition, as we find Berosus—a priest of the temple of Belus—testifying to it, and the ancient Hindus possessed the legend as given by *Vaivasvata.* Now, there is but one explanation of the extraordinary fact that of two contemporary and civilized nations like Egypt and Chaldea, one has preserved no tradition of it whatever, although it was the most directly interested in the occurrence—if we credit the Bible—and the other has. The deluge noticed in the Bible, in one of the Brahmanas, and in the Berosus Fragment, relates to the flood which, about 10,000 B.C., according to Bunsen, and according to Brahmanical computations of the Zodiac also, changed the whole face of Central Asia. Thus the Babylonians and the Chaldeans might have learned of it from their mysterious guests, christened by some Assyriologists Akkadians, or what is still more probable, they, themselves perhaps, were the descendants of those who had dwelt in the submerged localities. The Jews had the tale from the latter as they had everything else; the Brahmans may have re-

corded the traditions of the lands which they first invaded, and had perhaps inhabited before they possessed themselves of the Punjab. But the Egyptians, whose first settlers had evidently come from Southern (Dravidian) India, had less reason to record the cataclysm, since it had perhaps never affected them except indirectly, as the flood was limited to Central Asia.

It was Berosus who wrote for Alexander the Great the history of the Babylonian cosmogony, as taught in the temples, from the astronomical and chronological records preserved in the Temple of Belus. The only guide to this cosmogony may now be found in the fragments of the Assyrian tablets, evidently copied almost bodily from the earlier Babylonian records which—say what the Orientalists may—are undeniably the originals of the Mosaic Genesis, of the Flood, the tower of Babel, of baby Moses set afloat on the waters, and of other events. As the Babylonian accounts are restored from hundreds of thousands of broken fragments, the proofs here cited are comparatively scanty; yet such as they are, they corroborate almost every one of our teachings, certainly three at least. These are (1) That the race which was the first to fall into generation was a dark race (*Zalmat Gaguadi*), which they call the *Adami* or dark Race; and that *Sarku,* or the light Race, remained pure for a long while subsequently. (2) That the Babylonians recognised two principal Races at the time of the Fall, the Race of the Gods (the ethereal *doubles of the Pitris*) having preceded these two. These "Races" are our second and third root-races. (3) That the seven (primeval) Gods, each of whom created a *man,* or group of men, were "the gods *imprisoned* or incarnated." All these gods or "Lords" collectively *"who bestow Intelligence"* are our incarnating Dhyan Chohans, connected as well with the Elohim, and the seven informing gods of Egypt, Chaldea, and every other country. *Hea,* their synthesis, the god of Wisdom and of the Deep, is identified with *Oannes-Dagon,* at the time of the fall, and called (collectively) the Demiurge, or Creator.

Our races, all cosmogonies show, have sprung from divine races, by whatever name they are called. The Chaldeans had their ten and seven *Anedots,* which was the generic name for their Dragons of Wisdom. The name of the Dragon in Chaldea was not written phonetically, but was represented by two monograms, *probably* meaning, according to the Orientalists, "the scaly one." We find the priests assuming the names of the gods they served, the "Dragons"

held throughout all antiquity as the symbols of Immortality and Wisdom, of secret Knowledge and of Eternity. The allegory of *Oannes,* the Anedot, reminds us of the Dragon and Snake-Kings; the *Nagas* who in Buddhist legends instruct people in wisdom on lakes and rivers, and end by becoming converts to the good Law and *Arhats.* Musarus Oannes, the Anedot, known in the Chaldean "legend," transmitted through Berosus and other ancient writers as Dagon, the "Man-Fish," came to the early Babylonians as a reformer and an instructor. Appearing from the Erythraean (Red) Sea, he brought them civilization, letters and sciences, law, astronomy, religion, teaching them agriculture, geometry, and the arts in general. There were Anedoti who came after him; but Musarus Oannes was "the first to appear, and this he did in the reign of Ammenon, the third of the ten antediluvian Kings whose (*divine*) Dynasty ended with Xisuthrus, the Chaldean Noah." The meaning of the allegory is evident. The "fish" is an old and very suggestive symbol of the Mystery-language, as is also "water;" *Hea* was the god of the sea and Wisdom, and the sea serpent was one of his emblems, his priests being "serpents" or Initiates. The hidden meaning becomes clear to the Occultist once he is told that "this being (Oannes) was accustomed to pass the day among men, teaching; and when the sun had set, he retired again into the sea, passing the night in the deep, for he was *amphibios," i.e.,* he belonged to two planes, the spiritual and the physical. . . . Oannes is dimly reflected in Jonah, and even in John the Precursor, both connected with Fish and Water. Layard showed long ago that the "fish's head" was simply a head gear, the mitre worn by priests and gods, made in the form of a fish's head, and which in a very little modified form is what we see even now on the heads of the high Lamas and Romish Bishops. Osiris had such a mitre. The fish's tail is simply the train of a long stiff mantle as depicted on some Assyrian tablets, the form being seen reproduced in the sacerdotal gold cloth garment worn during service by the modern Greek priests.

What is known of Chaldean Moon-Worship, of the Babylonian god *Sin,* is very little, and that little is apt to mislead the profane student who fails to grasp the esoteric significance of the symbols. As popularly known to the ancient profane philosophers and writers (for those who were initiated were pledged to silence) the Chaldees were worshippers of the moon under *her* (and *his*) various names, just as were the Jews who came after them. Lunar magnet-

ism generates life, preserves and destroys it, psychically as well as physically. The worshippers of the *Teraphim* (the Jewish Oracles) "carved images and claimed that the light of the principal stars (planets) permeating these through and through, the angelic VIRTUES (or the regents of the stars and planets) conversed with them, teaching them many most useful things and arts." Seldenus explains that the *Teraphim* (idols) were built and composed after the positions of certain planets, and according to figures that were located in the sky and called the tutelary gods. With the Chaldeans the moon was Sin, and Nannak or Nannar, the son of Mulil, the older *Bel.* It is Mulil (Bel) who caused the waters of the Flood to fall from heaven on earth, for which Xisuthrus would not allow him to approach his altar. Behind the lunar "worship" was the secret teaching that the first race of men, the images and astral doubles of their Fathers, were the pioneers or the most progressed Entities from a preceding though lower sphere, the shell of which is now our Moon. But even this shell is all-potential, for having generated the earth, it is the *phantom* of the Moon which, attracted by magnetic affinity, sought to form its first inhabitants, the pre-human monsters. "While the gods were generated in the androgyne bosom of Mother-space, the reflection of *Hea*'s Wisdom became on earth the woman *Omoroka,* the Deep or the Sea, which esoterically or even exoterically is the Moon. It was the Moon (*Omoroka*) who presided over the monstrous (purely physical) creation of nondescript beings which were slain by the Dhyanis.

Traditions about a race of giants in days of old were universal; they exist in oral and written lore. Chaldea had her Idzubar (Nimrod), a hero, shown in all the tablets as a mighty giant who towered in size above all other men as the cedar towers over brushwood—a hunter, according to cuneiform legends, who contended with and destroyed the lion, tiger, wild bull, and buffalo, the most formidable animals. The Babylonian Venus was called *Ishtar,* "the eldest of heaven and earth" and daughter of Anu, god of heaven. The legend is that Ishtar, the beautiful goddess, descended into Hades after her beloved Tammuz, and found that this dark place of the shades had seven spheres and seven gates, at each of which she had to leave something belonging to her. Any Occultist who reads of her love for Tammuz, his assassination by Idzubar, the despair of the goddess and her descent and final liberation from the dark realm, will recognize the beautiful allegory of the soul in search of the Spirit.

Birs Nimrud is believed by the Orientalists to be the site of the tower of Babel. This great pile of Birs Nimrud is near Babylon. Rawlinson and several Assyriologists examined the excavated ruins and found that the tower consisted of seven stages of brick-work, each stage of a different color, which shows that the temple was devoted to the seven planets. Even with the three higher stages or floors in ruins, it still rises now 154 feet above the level of the plain. The Chaldeans, with the Egyptians, were among the most ancient votaries of Astrology. Egypt claimed the honor of its invention; the Chaldees taught the science to other nations.

The Akkadians and Chaldeans kept a Sabbath day of rest every seven days, they also had thanksgiving days, and days of humiliation and prayer. The number seven was especially sacred. The great temple of Babylon existed long before 2250 B.C. Its Holy of Holies was within the shrine of Nebo, the prophet god of Wisdom (Mercury).

The Chaldeans, whom Cicero counts among the oldest magicians, placed the basis of all magic in the inner powers of man's soul, and by the discernment of magic properties in plants, minerals, and animals. The magic of the ancient Chaldeans was but a profound knowledge of the powers of simples and minerals. By the aid of these they performed the most wonderful "miracles." Magic with them was synonymous with religion and science. It was only when the theurgist desired *divine* help in spiritual and earthly matters that he sought direct communication through religious rites, with pure spiritual beings. With them, even, those spirits who remain invisible and communicate with mortals through their awakened inner senses, as in clairvoyance, clairaudience, and trance, could only be evoked *subjectively* and as a result of purity of life and prayer. But all physical phenomena were produced simply by applying a knowledge of natural forces, although certainly not by the method of legerdemain, practised in our days of conjurers. There was a vast difference between the true worship taught to those who showed themselves worthy, and the state religions.

on the lookout

Eastern Theosophy and Psychology

The establishment of an annual East-West conference on philosophy at the University of Hawaii under the direction of C. A. Moore has served the cause of Theosophical education in numerous ways since its inauguration in 1950. The monthly magazine, *Philosophy East and West,* while scholarly in tone and circulated chiefly among professional philosophers, has also provided cross-fertilization between philosophy and psychology. Lookout has frequently quoted this journal, and has noted demonstrations of the immense psychological or "soul" content implicit in the philosophy of the East. For the reader of THEOSOPHY, there is also abundant evidence in *Philosophy* that the Sanskrit terminology has a living meaning and plays a valuable part in establishing a disciplined language for study.

An article in the April 1963 issue, "The Gunas of Prakriti According to the Samkhya Philosophy" by K. B. Ramakrishna Rao, begins with an interpretation of the Samkhya school as it is concerned with Nature in relation to evolution through self-transformation. (All diacritical Sanskrit marks have been dispensed with as being meaningless to the majority of Theosophical students, and the terms are spelled in the way familiar to them.) Mr. Rao writes:

> The philosophy of Nature of the Samkhya school is founded on the theory of "parinama" (transformation) of the unmanifest *prakriti* (primal Nature) into the manifest or the phenomenal world. As this is a change from the most undifferentiated to the most differentiated state of existence, it may also be called an "evolutionary" process. This process is made possible by the three "gunas" of *prakriti,* namely, *sattva* (*beingness* or existence), *rajas* (change), and *tamas* (resistance).

Meaning of Terms

The term *guna,* says Mr. Rao, was interpreted in several different ways in ancient Hindu: we may find it used in the metaphysical sense of "binding the purusha (self) in samsara (transmigration)"; as a synonym for "characteristic" or "quality" as distinguished from substance; or even used for "moral qualities," as in the *Mahabha-*

rata. After discussing these various interpretations, Mr. Rao states: "The gunas are the 'functional modes' of *prakriti,* the ways which *prakriti* takes to manifest itself. They are not 'qualities' in the Nyaya-Vaiseshika sense [as distinguished from substance], but have ontological significance; they are not different from *prakriti,* because they are the functional or operational forms of *prakriti* itself." Mr. Rao elaborates on the "ontological significance":

> *"Sattva"* is that which makes for "existence" or "beingness." *Prakriti* is *"sattva"* or itself "existence." This aspect of *prakriti* expresses the Samkhya conception of "realism" of the object entity, the *prakriti* as against all schools of thought emphasizing the reality of the subject only.
>
> *"Rajas"* is that which makes for "change in itself." *Prakriti* is *"rajas,"* or that which "changes." It is this aspect of *prakriti* which expresses the Samkhya conception of the "dynamism" of *prakriti,* enabling it to undergo transformation.
>
> And, lastly, *"tamas"* is that which "denies annihilation through change." *Prakriti* is *"tamas,"* or that which "restrains annihilation through change." This aspect of *prakriti* indicates the Samkhya opposition to all nihilistic interpretations of reality.

(We find that H.P.B. touches on these various aspects of *prakriti* and the qualities in the *Glossary*—under *Prakriti, Trigunas,* and *Trimurti*—and in *The Secret Doctrine,* where she frequently translates *prakriti* simply as "matter.")

The Three Qualities of Nature

The fourteenth chapter of the *Gita* is a treatise on the Three Qualities; and the following quotation from Mr. Rao might be considered as bearing on this chapter:

> According to the Samkhya, the entire objective reality is comprehensible by the concept of *prakriti,* for nothing exists outside the domain of *prakriti* which can be called at the same time "objective." Interpreted in terms of quantity, it is a fixed quantity, neither increasing nor decreasing, but remaining always a constant factor through the incessant processes of evolution or devolution.
>
> Treating *prakriti* in terms of quantity, which is unalterable, the argument may be expected to apply to the *gunas* in *samyavastha.* It may be said that *samyavastha* implies an equal distribution of the "available total quantity" of *prakriti*—whatever it might be, energy or matter—among the three *gunas.* . . . It may be pointed out here that, whereas a quantitative interpretation of the totality of *prakriti* is feasible, to conceive it as being equally

distributed among the individual *gunas* would not be possible. . . .

There is at least one way of overcoming this difficulty, even if the argument proceeds in terms of quantity. And that is to accept the total quantity of *prakriti* (be it energy or matter) but not the fixed quantitative equality of the three *gunas* and to allow "mutual transformation of convertibility within the totality of *prakriti.*" If *prakriti* is energy, its total quantity is constant, but *sattva, rajas,* and *tamas,* being different forms of the very same energy, are mutually convertible. . . .

The Gunas as "Infra-subtle Forces"

Mr. Rao concludes:

With reference to the nature of *gunas,* we have interpreted them as forms of energy expressive of *prakriti* itself. . . . They are so subtle and imperceptible that they pass beyond the sight of even the Great Sage, Kapila, who could see only their effects.

The phenomenal condition of *prakriti,* that is, the disturbed state of the equilibrium of the *gunas,* implies a varying proportion of these forces which go to make up the variety of the manifested world, in the following manner:

1. If the force making for "existence-in-itself" (*sattva*) predominates, the manifestation exhibits the physical characteristics of buoyancy and illumination, and a psychological characteristic of pleasure.

2. If the force making for "change-in-itself" (*rajas*) predominates, the manifestation exhibits the physical characteristics of stimulation and movement, and the psychological characteristics of pain and passion.

3. If the force making for "denial of existence through change" (*tamas*) predominates, the manifestation exhibits the physical characteristics of weight and resistance or inertia, and the psychological characteristic of despondency or dejection.

These three forces cannot be independently conceived of . . . for they mutually imply others functionally, that is they mutually suppress, co-operate, produce, and exist.

Basis of Theosophical Psychology

The foregoing discussion of *prakriti* and the *gunas* is given, not only because it deals with recondite points in cosmogenesis, but because, by adding what H.P.B. says on page 42 of *The Secret Doctrine* II—"unless, allegorically speaking, *Purusha* mounts on the shoulders of *Prakriti,* the latter remains irrational, while the former remains inactive without her"—we have the very substratum of Theosophical psychology. She writes (*S.D.* II, 635-6):

The light of life, as it were, seems to be refracted by the treble-faced prism of Prakriti, having the three Gunams for its three

faces, and divided into seven rays, which develop in course of time the seven principles of this classification. The progress of development presents some points of similarity to the gradual development of the rays of the spectrum. While the four-fold classification is amply sufficient for all practical purposes, this real seven-fold classification is of great theoretical and scientific importance. It will be necessary to adopt it to explain certain classes of phenomena noticed by occultists; and it is perhaps better fitted to be the basis of a perfect system of psychology.

The Human Personality

A pamphlet, *Personality,* issued by the Indian Institute of World Culture, comprised of five lectures given before the Institute in 1956 by Dr. Sita Ram Jayaswal, contains correlative material with emphasis on the psychological implications. In the foreword, a member of the Institute states the problems implicit in Dr. Jayaswal's lectures:

> What is personality? A mask, as the root of the word implies? And if so whose mask? That it is a living mask nobody questions, but what is its nature, what are its constituents? How does it function? Why should it be controlled? What is its relationship to the individuality, to the human thinker, using his organ of mind, and who is loosely called soul? . . . Whatever the name used there is a duality in man seen by all—a lower man of animal tendencies, a higher of divine potentialities. Any one can detect the presence of the animal and the angel in himself. . . .
>
> Man is not only dual but triple: he sees the animal nature in him and its propensities and goads; he also feels the fine aspirations to acquire wisdom, peace, strength, and is urged by the great purpose of using his acquisitions in serving his fellowmen. Between the animal and the divine, man feels himself standing. So he is bound, if he is logical and just to himself, to recognize his triple nature—animal, human, and divine.

Psychology—Different Points of Departure

Dr. Jayaswal first takes up various definitions of personality given by Western psychologists, then draws on the writings of several Eastern philosopher-psychologists. He concludes his first lecture as follows:

> And finally we have to see personality in the light of Theosophy which has its own unique system of psychology. Theosophy which plainly states man is a correlation of spiritual powers as well as of chemical and physical forces. It considers personality as the mask of individuality which endures through the cycle

of life and is immortal in essence. It is pointed out that "the personality, identifying its borrowed ray of consciousness with name and form, is like a part played by the individuality upon the stage of life." It is further suggested that "the Real Man can express himself . . . in the measure of the personality's purification and freedom from bondage to passions and desires, touching with nobility even the most trivial acts."

In the light of the above, it can safely be stated that the Western definitions of personality start with the assumption that man is a human animal. That is why there is no mention of the individuality of the Divine Ego. When the Western psychologists are able to understand that man is not only a biological being, but also a divine being with a reincarnating Ego, they will modify their definitions of personality and give the proper consideration and place in psychology to what has been described as the individuality of the Divine Ego.

Determinants of Personality

After considering biological and environmental determinants of personality, Dr. Jayaswal discusses heredity. Here he quotes William Q. Judge:

> Heredity in giving us a body in any family provides the appropriate environment for the Ego. The Ego goes only into the family which either completely answers its whole nature, or which gives an opportunity for the working out of its evolution, and which is also connected with it by reason of past incarnations.
>
> Heredity provides the tenement and also imposes those limitations of capacity of brain or body. . . . The limitations imposed on the Ego by any family heredity are exact consequences of that Ego's prior lives. The fact that such physical traits and mental peculiarities are transmitted does not confute reincarnation, since we know that the guiding mind and real character of each are not the result of a body and brain but are peculiar to the Ego in its essential life. Transmission of trait and tendency by means of parent and body is exactly the mode selected by nature for providing the incarnating Ego with the proper tenement in which to carry on its work. (*The Ocean of Theosophy.*)

The Gunas Again

The fourth lecture consists of a brief sketch of the varying emphases of eminent Western psychologists on the psycho-analytic approach to personality—Freud, Jung, Adler, the traditional Freudians, and the neo-Freudians. The author comments:

> The Freudians have made the "unconscious" the foundation-stone of the house they have built. But in the light of the Yoga

system it is observed that there is the Universal Consciousness, which is to be discovered by the individual by attaining a consciousness of his divinity. . . . Another way of looking at the unconscious, pre-conscious and conscious could be from the point of the *gunas* or ultimate reals. These *gunas* or reals are of three kinds: *sattva,* the intelligence-stuff, *rajas,* the energy-stuff, and the *tamas,* the mass-stuff. The unconscious may be considered as an aspect of *tamas,* the pre-conscious as of *rajas* and the conscious as that of *sattva.* Every individual differs from another on the basis of the varying degrees of these constituents. . . . For example, *sattva* indicates the highest state of *selflessness* or oneness with the Supreme Self, *rajas* that of selfishness and *tamas* of blind passion and fury. Thus we see that while Freud postulated the concept of the *unconscious* and the *libido,* he neglected *sattva,* the essential goodness in man.

The Mature Personality

In considering the gradual maturing of an individual, "one must pay attention to Karma," says Dr. Jayaswal, and quotes from H. P. Blavatsky on this point:

> That which makes one mortal a great man and of another a vulgar, silly person is . . . the quality and make-up of the physical shell or casing, and the adequacy or inadequacy of brain and body to transmit and give expression to the light of the real, Inner man; and this aptness or inaptness is, in its turn, the result of Karma.
>
> There are no privileges or special gifts for man, save those won by his own Ego through personal effort and merit throughout a long series of lives on earth.

"The mature person," Dr. Jayaswal says, "is open, spontaneous, free from inhibitions and prejudices; the *Gita* presents a perfect description of a really mature personality in our culture and in most civilized cultures of the world, for they are universal in nature." He then quotes from the *Gita*:

> He is the devotee who is jealous of none, who is a fount of mercy, who is without egotism, who is selfless, who treats alike cold and heat, happiness and misery, who is ever forgiving, who is always contented, whose resolutions are firm, who has dedicated mind and soul to God, who causes no dread, who is not afraid of others, who is free from exultation, sorrow, and fear, who is pure, who is versed in action and yet remains unaffected by it, who renounces all fruit, good or bad, who treats friend and foe alike, who is untouched by respect or disrespect, who is not puffed by praise, who does not go under when people speak ill of him, who loves silence and solitude.

Against the Death Penalty

And May God Have Mercy, by Eugene Block (Fearon Publishers, 1962), should be extremely useful to those who are working to end capital punishment. Mr. Block has supported movements for abolition of the death penalty for nearly fifty years, along with acquiring a distinctive reputation as a San Francisco newspaper man. The subtitle of his book is *The Case Against Capital Punishment,* and, as the table of contents indicates, it offers much information on the current status of the cause on many different "fronts," at home and abroad.

The humanitarian aspect of the argument against the death penalty has effective treatment in a chapter, "Victims of Vengeance, Poverty, and Prejudice." Many practical considerations follow naturally:

> In considering the opportunities for rehabilitation, the steady progress of medical psychological science must not be overlooked. Staffs of psychiatrists now functioning in many penitentiaries have done much to fathom the emotional disturbances of criminal offenders; in many cases, they have been able to overcome these disturbances. It is only reasonable to assume that this progress will continue and that in the years ahead still greater advances will be made, with vastly increased chances for success in rehabilitative therapy.

"Costs" of Life and Death

Mr. Block continues:

> With greater development of vocational programs in prisons a convict could contribute to the support of his family or even to that of his victim's dependents.
>
> Roy Calvert holds that the cost of life imprisonment to a state has no validity as an argument because, if abolition is just, a man's life should not be reckoned in dollars and cents. Others have commented ironically that if capital punishment is justified on a money-saving basis, then the state, for like reasons of economy, should take the lives of the criminally insane and of incurable patients in mental hospitals.
>
> Though one might readily assume that executions are cheaper for the state and consequently for the taxpayer, facts appear to prove that the state actually saves money by keeping a prisoner alive.

To show the prejudicial aspect of the law in relation to the death penalty, Mr. Block quotes from the House Committee of the District

of Columbia, while reporting favorably on a bill for abolition:

> As it is now applied, the death penalty is nothing but an arbitrary discrimination against an occasional victim. It cannot even be said that it is reserved as a weapon of retributive justice for the most atrocious criminals. It is not necessarily the most guilty who suffer it. Almost any criminal with wealth or influence can escape it, but the poor and friendless convict, without means or power to fight his case from court to court or to exert pressure upon the pardoning executive, is the one singled out as a sacrifice to what is no more than a tradition.

Summarization

Mr. Block's book is both a factual study and an appeal. He concludes:

> For those opposing the death penalty and striving for its abolition, there is much work ahead. Above all, they must study the facts and be fully prepared to meet the arguments of their opponents.
>
> Mobilization of public opinion should start at the grass roots level—in every city neighborhood, in every country town. The men who make the laws must be made to know the public will. Service clubs, women's groups, church groups, student organizations, civic bodies, and other organizations should be urged to study the question seriously, with open minds. State abolition groups should be supported; and where they do not exist, efforts should be made to create them and make them effective.
>
> Finally, abolitionists everywhere should affiliate with the central national organization, the American League to Abolish Capital Punishment, and give it active, moral, and financial support.
>
> The abolition movement grows and its followers are confident that with persistent effort abolition can be achieved in the not-too-distant future. They reject such cynicism as that expressed by George Bernard Shaw in *Caesar and Cleopatra*: "To the end of history, murder shall breed murder, always in the name of right and honor and peace; until the gods are tired of blood and create a race that can understand."

Theosophy and the "Birdman of Alcatraz"

This past fall, Robert Stroud, probably the most celebrated prisoner of recent times, died at the age of seventy-three, his long fight for freedom unwon. From the age of nineteen until his death, Stroud had spent his life in prison, much of that time "in solitary." *Manas* for May 22, 1957, summarized the hardships Stroud underwent, his long fight for freedom, and his ultimate disappointment.

During these prison years, however, Stroud augmented his third-

grade education by extensive reading in the prison library, and, in addition to his intensive study of birds, learned something of mathematics, astronomy, languages, music, painting, law, and philosophy. Thomas E. Gaddis, in his biography of Stroud, *Birdman of Alcatraz,* relates the following facts concerning Stroud's early days in Leavenworth:

> His hatred of punishment grew with his reading and his pent-up ego swelled with the view of worlds he could not reach. He became grave and inwardly ardent. He studied and worked deeper into astronomy, seeing, in his mind's eye, the sky and its heavenly bodies swimming in limitless space. . . . His aversion to what he called "Christian bigots" kept his mind away from religion. But now he discovered something truly illimitable, beyond astronomy, in the spacious metaphysics of the Orient. He stumbled upon theosophy. One of his letters to his mother revealed that, even as a boy, he had held the persistent notion that he had lived before. . . . Enthralled by his reading, Stroud embraced the brotherhood of Karma, thought-transference and reincarnation.

A Philosophy to Live By

The following paragraphs from Mr. Gaddis' account will doubtless be of interest to Theosophists:

> The prison library included several books on the subject [of theosophy]. In nearby Kansas City there was a strong theosophical current running in revolt against the babbitry of the Bible Belt. Stroud soon became identified with the Kansas City Theosophical Society. Its members visited him and later advanced funds to aid him in his subsequent legal trials.
>
> Stroud's twin pursuit of physical science and theosophy produced a heady mental brew. He noted one contradiction, however. "I soon saw the two phases of theosophy," he wrote his mother, "the theory and practice of occultism, and the holding of life with respect to the theory of brotherhood, *karma.* I saw wherein the first was of more danger than value, while the second was of the highest value attainable. I started to live by the second phase. I have treated all of the people of my own kind as the teaching would dictate, so long as they would live up to the laws of our world."

A Buddhist's Appreciation of H.P.B.

Christmas Humphreys, President-Founder of the London Buddhist Society, in reviewing *Obituary, The "Hodgson Report" on Madame Blavatsky, 1885-1960* (see Lookout for February), writes in *The Middle Way* for November, 1963:

> I for one welcome this well-documented destruction of the infamous attack made on Mme. Blavatsky by M. and Mme Coulomb, two servants in her employ, whose "confession" of alleged conspiracy with her to produce bogus phenomena was the basis of the now discredited "Hodgson Report" published by the Society for Psychical Research in 1885. . . . In this most careful pamphlet the lies are exposed and destroyed, and it is revealed that even the S.P.R. refused to believe a large proportion of the Coulomb's allegations.
>
> This is a sorry story, and an ugly aspect of the human mind. Why do we resent any teaching which destroys our cherished beliefs, as *Isis Unveiled* exposed the pretensions of current religious and scientific belief? Why this strange exhibition of sheer pleasure in repeating vile abuse against those who teach but the noblest principles, and reveal vistas of cosmic truth at the time un-known? Surely Buddhists should set an example to the contrary, yet many of them damn Theosophy who have not read one word of *The Secret Doctrine,* or even of "H.P.B.'s" translation *The Voice of the Silence,* that exquisite Tibetan scripture accepted as such by Evans-Wentz and many another Tibetologist, as well as by His Holiness the Dalai Lama who signed my copy in 1956. Having studied the writings of H. P. Blavatsky and the scriptures of Buddhism for over forty years, I find this blind, unreasoning prejudice both strange and saddening. Much light is thrown on Buddhist teaching by the works of this great woman, who herself was trained in Tibet, and whatever be said about the later teachings of Theosophy, at least Theosophists do not display the intolerance of which their Buddhist brothers should be ashamed. May I suggest that those who are minded to vilify their fellow Buddhist, H. P. Blavatsky, should begin by reading what she said. By that she is willing to be judged, rather than by allegations made by a couple who had been sacked from her employ on *uncontested* charges of extortion, blackmail, slander and fraud.

Such forthright appreciation of H.P.B. will naturally please Theosophists who focus their study on the teachings as recorded by H. P. Blavatsky.